

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
25 February 1970
INDEX

	Page
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	
1. <u>Date of Next Meeting</u>	1
2. <u>Approval of Minutes</u>	1
3. <u>Development of the Georgetown Waterfront</u>	1
<u>SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS</u>	
1. <u>Presidents Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue</u> <u>Appeal to Retain the Old Post Office Tower</u>	1; 3
2. <u>National Gallery of Art</u> <u>East Building of the National Gallery of Art</u>	2-3; 3
3. <u>General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service</u> <u>National Zoological Park - Phase 6: Site and Building Plans</u> <u>for Display of Apes, Monkeys, Lions and Giraffes</u>	2; 3,4
4. <u>D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency</u> <u>Pepco Electrical Substation, 3rd and E Sts., S.E. - Re-</u> <u>submission of Proposed Exterior Materials</u>	2
5. <u>American Battle Monuments Commission</u> <u>Proposed Selection of Paul Thiry as architect for Distinguished</u> <u>Military Actions Commemorative Program</u>	2
6. <u>Department of the Army, Heraldic Division</u> <u>a. Congressional Space Medal - Proposed Design</u> <u>b. Presidential Citizens Medal - Proposed Design</u>	2
7. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development</u> <u>Shipstead-Luce Act</u> <u>Old Georgetown Act</u>	3 3

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
25 February 1970

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on February 25, 1970. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:00 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Kevin Roche

Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Daniel D. Reiff

Reporter: Mrs. L. M. Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of the next meetings was set for 25 March and 15 April.
2. The minutes of the 21 January 1970 meeting were approved.
- 3, Development of the Georgetown Waterfront

The Chairman felt that the development of the waterfront in Georgetown probably would be one of the most important issues to come before the Commission in the next few months. He felt that the Commission should take an unequivocal stand on the elimination of the elevated highways along the waterfront. The members were unanimous in their support of the Chairman's proposal. The transcript of the discussion is attached. EXHIBIT A

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Presidents Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue

Appeal to Retain the Old Post Office Tower as a part of Federal Triangle Plans

No discussion pending presentation by Mr. Owings of the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

2. National Gallery of Art

East Building of the National Gallery of Art - Proposed Design

The principal issue that evolved from the inspection of drawings was

the Chairman's concern for the height of the new building, particularly in relation to the Capitol. It was not the physical height per se that was of concern as much as the scale of the unbroken wall surfaces, which would be in sharp contrast to other classical buildings on Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue. Mrs. Saarinen agreed. The other members felt this would not be objectionable and, in fact, indicated that it might even be advantageous to have such a strong building at the intersection of the two avenues. No action was taken pending a discussion with the architects.

3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Zoological Park - Phase 6: Site and Building Plans for Display of Apes, Monkeys, Lions and Giraffes

It was pointed out that the designs of previous buildings approved by the Commission had been changed in the process of going from preliminary to working drawings. What had originally been conceived as structures primarily set into the landscape had evolved to the contrary, i.e. the structures extended considerably above grade and were much more architectural in their treatment. This feeling also pervaded the new designs. After considerable discussion the members agreed to recommend a return to their original concept of diminishing the architectural character of individual buildings and allowing the feeling of landscape to prevail. Further discussion withheld pending meeting with the architects.

4. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Pepco Electrical Substation, 3rd and E Sts., S.E. - Resubmission of Proposed Exterior Materials

The use of acrylic plastic sheets with "pebbled" exterior texture was approved for the facade panels.

EXHIBIT B

5. American Battle Monuments Commission

Proposed Selection of Paul Thiry as architect for Distinguished Military Actions Commemorative Program

Selection of Paul Thiry as architect for the Distinguished Military Actions Commemorative Program was approved.

EXHIBIT C

6. Department of the Army, Heraldic Division

a. Congressional Space Medal - Proposed Design

b. Presidential Citizens Medal - Proposed Design

There was no objection to the proposed design of the Congressional Space Medal and the Presidential Citizens Medal.

EXHIBIT D

7. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix 1 was approved.

EXHIBIT E

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2 was approved.

EXHIBIT F

IV. INTERVIEWS

1. Presidents Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue

Appeal to Retain the Old Post Office Tower as a Part of Federal Triangle Plans

Mr. Owings showed a movie prepared by the staff of the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission with views of and from the Old Post Office Tower on Pennsylvania Avenue. A brief appeal followed the presentation in which Owings argued for the retention of the tower on the basis of sentiment and the relief he felt the tower would give to the skyline and the "life" on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue. Following Mr. Owings departure, it was agreed that no further action was necessary on the part of the Commission. A copy of the transcript of the discussion attached.

EXHIBIT G

2. National Gallery of Art

East Building of the National Gallery of Art - Proposed Design

Following a brief discussion of the plans the matter of height was raised by the Chairman. Mr. Freed, who was representing Mr. Pei who was unable to attend, said that this was an issue also of great concern to the architects and it had been very carefully studied from all aspects. They felt that the height was acceptable. Following the presentation there was a general discussion of the design. It was unanimously agreed that the plans were excellent but it was not unanimous regarding the height of the proposed building. The vote to approve was six to two with the Chairman and Mrs. Saarinen disapproving. Transcript of the discussion attached.

EXHIBITS H, I

3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Zoological Park - Phase 6: Site and Building Plans for Display of Apes, Monkeys, Lions and Giraffes

There was a brief setting forth of the Commission's earlier conclusions that landscape and natural setting should predominate over individual architectural style. It was then pointed out the concept of a zoo complex could be approached from the point of view of integrating all of the displays with the natural setting in a unique combination of sculpture and architecture. This could be done in such a way that there would be complete architectural unity within the various displays without sacrificing the widely varying physical requirements of

the animals. However this was an ideal approach and because the new developments were within the context of retaining certain existing buildings it would probably be impossible to fully realize this kind of approach. Nevertheless such a feeling could still pervade to some extent the new development. A transcript of the discussion is attached.

EXHIBITS J, K

The meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles H. Atherton".

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

this kind of design.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Actually, the Heraldry Department has done better than usual. I'd have no objection to these.

MR. WALKER: I certainly have no objection to the first one. I have not seen the other yet.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They are much more standard medalese.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we ought to continue to say we have no objection.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, no objection, which is perfectly legitimate.

I want to put into the record just the fact what we were talking about a little earlier, the Chairman has been having conversations with both the National Parks Department and Highway Department to see if there isn't some way that the Commission of Fine Arts can influence the design of the highway on the Georgetown Waterfront, which in its present state and in two other alternatives, both seem disastrous, and I would hate for our term of office, that we were not on record disapproving this solution to a very important -- not just Georgetown area but the link of the National Capital Parks System up the river and into Potomac Park, and so forth.

EXHIBIT A

This is the last link and it is a great challenge to make a great park, and to me it is worth any effort that we can make perpetually saying no to every bad design in that area, or it will always be on our record that we were the ones who let them do it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, do they submit to us?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They will and have, but it is so important to get our foot in the negotiation early. It is now up there politically because the Secretary of Transportation this morning issued a statement asking for re-study of the whole highway link there, but I would hope that I had the backing of the Commission to represent you and perpetually try to make that a decent piece of design in our time. If they build it over our protests, all right, but I think we should have tried unceasingly.

MRS. SMITH: It's the last part of the city.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is this related to the bridge we approved?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, the technical approach to the bridge is okay. It's as you come back toward the city that they are screwing it up.

MRS. SMITH: It can go below grade.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There are many things it can do.

MR. BUNSHAFT: As a matter of fact, there are tricks going on, on that bridge.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We know, but if there are no objections from the Commission, I am going to continue to try to do something about it.

MRS. SMITH: Well, I think the important thing is that it is really the last piece of waterfront. In fact, it's all monuments.

MR. WALKER: Is there no possibility of moving that railroad depot there?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will go, and it is not lethal to the existence of a park. If you would walk through there, you'd see. No, you can live with it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The thing I don't quite understand, do they have to submit to us?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, yes.

I think we have many contiguous areas that make submission to us absolutely inevitable, to say nothing of simply the Georgetown area. It's within that historic area.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can they go ahead if we just disapprove?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Sure, we're finally just advisory.

Well, we don't have to settle all that now.

MR. WALKER: We agree with your suggestion. I feel very strongly about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I just want it on the record so that, you know -- I am trying to, and if any of you have any ideas of how you can participate, pray do. There are some of the black hats that we were going to get to, the transportation lobby, the truckers association are very important. Mr. Robert Baker.

MR. WALKER: Well, would Abel help on this?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No clout whatsoever. It is a far more gutsy battle than that. This is big interests. He would be for us completely, but it's way beyond him.

MR. WALKER: Anyone in Georgetown that you know that has any influence?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's way beyond a Georgetown issue. It is a struggle within the U.S. Government, between very strong forces. I won't be decided upon on a Georgetown preservation issue.

MR. WALKER: Is the objection to the tunnel that it costs too much?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Essentially, and they hate to

face the reality that the Whitehurst Freeway was badly designed, ill conceived, and ought to be destroyed.

MRS. SMITH: And it cost only \$3 million to build.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Peanuts! They're going to spend more than that to make it useable.

MR. BUNSHAFT: These things are being designed by engin-ers who worry only about grades. Actually that is the growing thing in the country--there's a growing movement against it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is the only real reason I think we might have a chance of winning it.

We're entering a change in this country away from that point of view, and if the highway people win, it will be their last victory, but let's try to deprive them of the last victory.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The engineering approach is destroying the environment. That's been around since 2000 B.C.

MRS. SMITH: If I heard the word "ecology" again, I'm going to scream.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But politicians would understand that more than anything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Could we do the Pepco electric

9 March 1970

Dear Mr. Betts:

I have your letter regarding the finishing materials for the Southwest Pepco Substation.

Following the meeting on the 25th of January, I phoned Dave Condon directly and told him that the Commission had approved the acrylic plastic. This letter is merely to confirm the Commission's action.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Keith W. Betts
Acting Director
Land Disposition Office
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

EXHIBIT B

10 March 1970

Dear General Adams:

This will confirm the Commission of Fine Arts approval of the selection of Mr. Paul Thiry as architect for the Distinguished Military Actions Commemorative Program.

Thank you for the list of new members of the Battle Monuments Commission. I'm glad to know that they will take a trip shortly and see the monuments first hand, as there are quite a few I believe that are in need of repair.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Major General A. J. Adams
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
Washington, D.C. 20360

EXHIBIT C

11 March 1970

Dear Colonel Dundas:

This will confirm my telephone conversation on February 25th with Miss Landrum, reporting the Commission of Fine Arts approval of the Congressional Space Medal and the Presidential Citizens Medals.

This will also confirm the Commission's approval of the Paul A. Siple Award for Achievement in Army Research.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Lt. Col. G. W. Dundas
Commanding Officer
The Institute of Heraldry
U.S. Army
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia

EXHIBIT D

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

PROJECT

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

SL 70-

22 2600 Penna. Ave., NW Rebuild exist. service station.
Humble Oil & Ref. Co.
ACTION: App'd. as revised. Request sample of brick for review, 2/10/70.

23 516 No. Capitol St., NW Canvas canopy with fixed iron frames & fixed iron posts.
Wearleys Restaurant Extends 24' from bldg.
ACTION: App'd., as revised, 2/10/70.

24 2335 Va. Ave., NW 1 d-f, 23.3 sq-ft sign on pole to replace exist. sign on pole.
B-P Oil Corp. Service Station
ACTION: App'd., provided sign be externally illuminated with two 200-watt incandescent bulbs mounted on mast arms at top of sign, with reflectors designed to shine back on sign, 2/24/70.

PROJECTADDRESS AND OWNERNO
OG 70-

73 1314-35th St., NW New residence.

Mr. Harry J. Smith, Jr.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that vertical notch approx. 4" deep be introduced in the middle of the front elevation, & that either muntins be omitted from casement windows, or windows be 3 lights high. Also request clarification of panels in garage door, 1/28/70.

77 1423-36th St., NW

Mrs. Clifford J. Moore

Raze residence in entirety. 2 fls. over basemt. Frame with brick addn. in rear. Not condemned by D.C.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest study of retention of original gabled structure, demolishing rear brick addn., & incorporating new structure to the north and east, FEB 16 1970

79 2915 M St., NW

"The Guards" Restaurant

1 d-f, 12 sq-ft sign. Plywood & iron. Red, gold & black trim

ACTION: No obj. to design, but request accurate drawing showing that sign is mounted above projecting cornice, 2/2/70.

80 2915 M St., NW

"The Guards" Restaurant

Install flag pole over entr. To project 3' from bldg. 12' above sidewalk.

ACTION: No obj. to flagpole, but request accurate drawing showing method of attachment to wall. Attachment should be above projecting cornice, 2/2/70.

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER PROJECT

OG 70-

81 1314-35th St., NW Subm. of revised drawings of new residence.

Harry J. Smith, Jr.
ACTION: Recom'd., 2/12/70.

82 3328 N St., NW Install aluminum siding on front wall.

Mrs. Janet B. Henderson
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that care be exercised in treatment of details, such as projection of window framing, & corner boards, 2/19/70.

83 1054-31st St., NW Canvas awning over shop entr.

Canal Square Assn.
ACTION: Recom'd., 2/19/70.

84 3108 M St., NW Remove store front & replace with 2 doors & window.

C. Heurich (Commercial)
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that the brickwork is painted to match exist. bldg., 2/19/70.

85 1073-31st St., NW 3 electrical lights

Wood Shop Canal Mart
ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest three cylinder-type lights over entranceway, 2/25/70.

Inf.

86 2622 P St., NW

J. F. Harris (Commercial)

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest that proposed showwindow alteration be more in character with exist. bldg., 2/25/70.

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 70-

87	1042 Wisc. Ave., NW Georgetown Printing Co. ACTION: Recom'd., 2/19/70.	2 s-f signs, flat against bldg. Gold ltrs. on black bckgd.
88	3333 Reservoir Rd., NW Lesson Smith ACTION: Recom'd., 2/19/70.	Remodel windows in 1st fl. front & 3rd fl. rear.
89	1042 Wisc. Ave., NW Georgetown Printing Co. ACTION: Recom'd., provided that the mechanical equipment is painted a light neutral color, 2/19/70.	Install cooling tower for air cond. units for printing plant press operation.
90	1221-36th St., NW Georgetown U. ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest that exist. stone wall be extended to gateway. Also request details of wrought-iron work, 2/25/70.	7' high w.i. fence with brick columns & double gate.
78	1218 Wisc. Ave., NW 1218 Wisc. Ave., Inc. ACTION: Not recom'd. Units should be adequately screened from public view. Suggest cedar sapling fence or wooden slatted fence. No chain link, 2/20/70.	Replace hood, exhaust duct & blower.

(Pennsylvania Avenue - Old Post Office Tower)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Step right up. We are here to be taken care of, Mr. Owings. You all read his statement to the press that he'd take care of the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. OWINGS: That wasn't a definition.

Well, of course I couldn't get this distinguished group to take a walk, I'm sure. May I impose upon your good nature for a minute -- for exactly eleven minutes to take a movie walk? It's our own movie.

(A film depicting the Old Post Office Tower, the Federal Triangle, and surroundings was shown.)

MR. OWINGS: I'd like to say that I worked on the Commerce Building. I know that the detailing and quality of the exterior design is such that in my opinion there's no possibility of reproducing today an extension of that quality into the new buildings. I just don't think there's that much money, and I don't think there are that many craftsmen. There wasn't anything on these buildings that was not actually full-size details, believe it or not -- the stone columns, every one of the brackets, every column, the marble and granites were especially selected.

I think we should face up to the fact that you just can't get a reproduction of the quality of the 1930s in the new building that will be put adjacent to the old building.

Thank you for listening and looking. I've been

EXHIBIT G

involved in this project since 1962, as some of you know. I have here the green book which we published, with several signatures of those present here today: Chloethiel Smith, Bill Walton, and I guess that's it.

Now I had breakfast with Pat Moynihan this morning at the White House, at his invitation, and I am authorized to say if there is any question in your minds about the attitude of the White House, the President and the staff are completely in support of preserving this tower within the limits of the law.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Your position is not the whole building -- it's the tower?

MR. ROUSOS: My position has always been the tower only. I wanted to try to eliminate any possible misunderstandings, because I understand that you have unanimously recommended the elimination of the tower and this is without any presentation on my part and it's probably negligence on my part that I wasn't here, but I didn't know about it, and I was not invited, so I realize I was up against a pretty tough situation.

But I want to point out that the White House wants to preserve the tower, if they can, and they expect to pursue all reasonable avenues to preserve it. Secondly, the

GSA presented a resolution at the last NCPC meeting which occurred after you had announced you were opposed to it, to keep the tower. That is tabled until the 5th of March. GSA -- the cost which is in the neighborhood of \$2 million or maybe more, is related to \$135 million in that relationship, so if the \$2 million goes up, the \$135 million goes up. It is not a consideration. The Avenue's aesthetics are greater than the cost, and as far as the space is concerned, it is all a leaf-raking program anyway--don't need the space. So loss of space is not a consideration, cost is not a consideration, the White House is in favor of it.

On those three grounds I leave it entirely to the matter of aesthetics, so far as I know.

MR. WALKER: Yes.

MR. OWINGS: Now, the policy that the ad hoc committee gave us on design of the Avenue, and this is the real reason I feel so desperately about this, we were advised to have a marriage between business and government. We were also advised to get activity and life in the Avenue. With that in mind, it's hard for me to understand how we could kill the only -- the publisher chose this cover, we didn't (holding aloft a copy of a book, "The Avenue of the Presidents" by Mary Cable).

In my opinion, I would phrase it if you tear down this tower, you're destroying the only juice left on the Avenue.

I want to point out in history that Daniel Burnham's group recommended elimination of the Smithsonian Institution's red brick buildings, and until we came into the plan about 1964 on the mall, those were still scheduled for demolition. Now, in my opinion, again it would have been a disaster. I think we have changing fashions, and I think those fashions are something that we cannot predict, but I don't see any justification for destroying something that has been there seventy years. It's like having a right-of-way through your property. It is an easement. I just feel that it is again creating the thing we're doing to our country every day. We are demolishing our individuality and replacing it with mediocrity and banality.

Now I was asked what I would do about the design, and I said well, we have a good architect and I would go to the architect to solve the problem, but I'd like to point out that the plan is not being carried out because the District Building was to be demolished also according to the records, and I have those records, so there isn't any consistency in that. And there isn't any consistency if you

say you are going to reproduce the plan exactly the way it was.

The last point is the quality of the materials in that building, the integrity of the design as a native piece of American architecture, are complete, and the big job that we chose for ourselves is esthetically on the Avenue, as you ladies and gentlemen know, was to frame the historic buildings, frame the past and use the ^{modern} and contemporary as a framework for these buildings. We are not trying to build a museum. We are not trying in any way to have this so pure that it is sterile.

I'd just like to finish with a statement from Francis Bacon, 1561, in an essay on beauty: "There is no excellent beauty that has not some strangeness in the proportions."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Don't go away.

MR. WALKER: Don't go away; you've not convinced us yet.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It was a very eloquent and well-presented statement, and I wish to congratulate you on it from beginning to end.

MRS. SAARINEN: ^{May} I ask three questions?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You may.

MRS. SAARINEN: First of all, do I understand, Mr. Owings, that you believe there is no difference in quality between this tower and the Renwick Smithsonian buildings? You equated them in your speech.

MR. OWINGS: I think in the idiom and the belief in the Richardsonesque. In other words, they are imitating the Richardsonesque instead of the Renwick.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes, I understand.

MR. OWINGS: Quality of the material.

MRS. SAARINEN: No, the quality of the design. You were saying these were of equal quality. You are saying this is architecturally of the same quality, not the same style -- the same quality?

MR. OWINGS: Of course not -- but by "quality" I mean it's equality in the basic Americana that it exhibits.

MRS. SAARINEN: All right. Okay.

MR. OWINGS: In its quality.

MRS. SAARINEN: Okay.

MR. OWINGS: I am not saying if you were going to compare this with the Richardsonesque building, it is as good as the Richardson.

MRS. SAARINEN: No, I was comparing it to the

Renwick, Mr. Owings.

MR. OWINGS: I am saying they both should be preserved for the same reason -- we need those styles as they exist in Washington.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Excuse me. The parallel is not quite apropos, since it would be a true parallel only if you were preserving one tower, not a red brick building.

MR. OWINGS: You missed the parallel.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Go on. We're following you.

MR. OWINGS: Let me finish that, though. The parallel is not between the buildings with me; the parallel is with the questioning of your omniscience as a board and your wisdom and how the people are going to feel fifty years from now about your decisions.

MRS. SAARINEN: All right, the second question is: am I correct or have I misunderstood, since our previous meetings on this, you are still talking only about the tower? We're not talking about the entire building?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: yes, I asked you this.

MR. OWINGS: I'd like to go through that. This was the one controversial item which it says in the green book and required a majority vote--a vote -- I don't remember what the majority was. I think Bill Walton was running the

meeting at the time. Basically, though, one of my other points here, if there is any relevancy in continuity of actions, this Board voted to keep the tower.

MRS. SAARINEN: Not the building?

MR. OWINGS: Not the building. That is Number One.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's the answer to my second question.

MR. OWINGS: They did not discuss whether to keep the arcade or not.

The second point they voted on, it was again voted on by the board of the number constituted, the temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, and twice they approved it.

MRS. SAARINEN: Approved saving the tower, now, we are talking about, not the building?

MR. OWINGS: That's right.

MRS. SAARINEN: My next question to you, Mr. Owings, I find it very difficult to understand myself what the base of thatwoer is. What are we talking about? Where is the base of the tower? What do you want us to vote to preserve?

MR. OWINGS: I'll tell you. I would like to have you vote to preserve the shaft of this tower as a campanile.

MRS. SAARINEN: Where is the bottom of it?

MR. OWINGS: The building is destroyed, and you have a choice of varying types of base. One would be to keep this (indicating on photograph), the arcade, and have a colonnade around the bottom. This is a matter for the architect to determine because it is being freed up from the building.

MRS. SAARINEN: Then we're being asked to preserve what--what is that? Seven-eighths of a tower?

MR. OWINGS: Now, I'd say that you are being asked to preserve a tower whose base would be submitted to you for your approval. If they could not meet your approval on a satisfactory base that would tie into the new building, then it could come down.

MRS. SAARINEN: All right.

MR. OWINGS: Now, I want to say that Warnecke had it and I don't know whether his plans were submitted to this Commission or not or were approved or disapproved.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No.

MRS. SAARINEN: They were not submitted.

MR. OWINGS: I'd like to say we submitted our plan to this Board at least once, and I thought we got

approval in principle at one time, which included the tower.

I'd like to say, here is a tower I just picked up (handing a newspaper page showing a photograph of a tower).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I want to clear up one thing. Our decision on this is not going to be based on the record of previous decisions. We are only going to be concerned with the esthetics of the total city and Pennsylvania Avenue. We don't care how many Commissions have decided what at different times.

MR. OWINGS (referring to photograph): As you see it today.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's fine for a court record, but we're not judicial. We switch our views and come down on different sides as often as we want, and we're totally free to do it.

MR. OWINGS: I would like to bring up the fact that we who have to depend on your decisions should have some measures to stick by in our actions.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we are very unreliable this way.

MR. OWINGS: I didn't say that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are going to continue to consider this as an esthetic decision based just on the landscape of Washington.

Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Yes, now I was influenced and may have based my decision on the drawing submitted by the architect without the tower. Do you think the design submitted by the architect, forget about the sentimental or historic interest or picturesqueness, do you think the design with the tower is better than without the tower?

MR. OWINGS: I think it's about a thousand percent better. I think personally I would refuse to complete if I were given the job as architect for the triangle, I'd refuse to do it in an imitation of the _____, which is an imitation of the Roman, so I think anything that's here, it's like a tree to me or a mountain. To answer your question, I do not consider that it is valid to have a design for the triangle put in today without the tower.

MR. WALKER: I don't think you have answered my question quite. Let's make a basic assumption which is that you're going to complete the Delano Aldrich Building. Then would you or would you not have a tower?

MR. OWINGS: That's an impossible question for me to answer because we have the tower; it's existed, has been there for seventy years. If we were building this in Des Moines, Iowa, the triangle, I'd certainly not introduce this tower into that design. If we were building this anywhere else except here, I wouldn't, but I doubt very much if anybody would do it anywhere else, but here. In other words, we are discussing two existing types of architecture, not one. In no way that I know -- I did detailing, and I know the extraordinary cost of the craftsmanship that went into these buildings in just detail. You are going to have a lousy job. If I had an opportunity to discuss this thing, I'd start by saying let's keep the old and fit the new to it. That's what the Greeks and Romans do. That is what the Greek Revival did. You go to New England, you find three columns if they needed three. They didn't have to have four or two. But that's not my job. I am pleading to save this old lady as a part of the fact that the American people just don't have any record of the past any more, and that is what we need more of.

MRS. SAARINEN: But you are saving part of the old lady.

MR. OWINGS: Look! If you came to me and said, "I'd

like to keep the whole building," I'd say, "I can't believe you."

MRS. SAARINEN: Frankly, I'd rather save the whole building than just save the tower, which seems to me total idiocy, like saving, say, one of my arms.

MR. OWINGS: What do you think of the tower in San Marco?

MRS. SAARINEN: I think it's a hell of a lot more beautiful tower than that.

MR. OWINGS: All right, it's partly because you paid \$2,000 to get over there.

MR. WALKER: Oh, no!

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's keep this to a slightly higher level.

MR. OWINGS: And you like the pigeons. I know my wife, when she saw that tower, said, "My God! I know where they got that; they got that from Harvard."

MRS. SAARINEN: Unlike your wife, I don't have a degree in architecture.

MR. OWINGS: Basically if you want to keep the old building, that's a different kettle of fish because Americans have a peculiar thing about keeping buildings they can't use, and our computers would not go into this building,

but the tower has no other use than view and esthetics, which is why we're trying to save it. If you came back and said, "The whole building or nothing," we'd take it and try to work it out.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am assuming from the general tenor of everything you've said, Mr. Owings, you are against this particular style of architecture upon completion, say, of the circle facing the Post Office?

MR. OWINGS: You mean the classic?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, that the detail and everything is impossible to reproduce now, so your choice would be for some different kind of architecture?

MR. OWINGS: Not Gothic.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, I didn't mean that. We are not going to be Greco-Roman.

MR. OWINGS: What I was expressing there was we have two difficult problems, not one.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But they're related.

MR. OWINGS: Very much related.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But you've not answered.

MR. OWINGS: Haven't answered you?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, you haven't.

MR. OWINGS: Well, I haven't got the contract to do it, and I haven't been offered it, so I have no comment.

MRS. SMITH: Has the Commission prepared any decision for the base of that tower?

MR. OWINGS: Chloethiel, for the reason deliberately we've not is because we have an architect. We have one every now and then. We had Warnecke and now have Kling, so our job is simply to ask for completion of the tower.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Pennsylvania Avenue Commission is not supposed to be a design agency.

MR. OWINGS: Well, we're like you. We make up our own minds what we think we are, but at the moment we don't think we are.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Anyone have any more questions? We will certainly take your proposal under serious consideration.

MR. OWINGS: Thank you for your courtesy and I'd like to say that when we lose a battle, we run away and fight another day.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Don't assume that.

We'll take a temporary recess and the Commission alone will stay in the room for a few minutes. It will be

about ten or fifteen minutes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I want to report to you there is a stool pigeon here who reports everything that is said. He did in the last meeting -- one of the planning people.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'll have one of our gossip sessions without anyone else in the room. There's no reason not to be on the record for this discussion.

MR. ROCHE: I would like to clarify where we stand with respect to this whole problem. I missed the meeting where the thing was originally proposed, where a solution was proposed.

MRS. SAARINEN: I missed the second one.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. We issued no formal statement on our proceeding. When Mr. Atheron told them we had voted unanimously --

MRS. SAARINEN: This is the first session?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, we only took action on the second, I think. Let me answer Kevin's question. I think the only statement we have made of any kind was Mr. Atherton's verbal statement. I issued no statement, no release, on purpose. There was no particular reason to start firing

when a battle was inevitable anyway. We are perfectly free to take any action whatsoever.

MR. ROCHE: Have we formally taken action or are you saying we have not?

MR. BUNSHAFT: The last meeting we voted unanimously. It's in the record.

MR. ROCHE: That the tower be removed?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But that does not have to inhibit us. I'd much more prefer to be wide open on every issue when nothing has happened in the interim.

MR. ROCHE: It was not clear to me at the last meeting that the building would not be completed in the same detail as --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely. It was very clear to us it was going to be, and identical detail.

MR. ROCHE: That is what I understood.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I clarify that? You people have been missing these meetings. The first meeting, there were two basic issues at the first meeting, one about this tower and one the statement of the architect to the effect he would like to complete it in the style it was, even though it was great discomfort to him, and we congratulated

him -- the whole group did, on trying to do it as it was instead of trying to do it modern and have too many funny connections. That is No. 1. That is what happened in the first meeting. We really practically kissed him. The tower he had eight different presentations, none of which we liked.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Obviously.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We told him we did not think the tower should stay.

Now in the second meeting, Kevin was here -- Aline was at the first one -- the second meeting -- Sasaki had been at the first meeting. We kind of reviewed what had happened at the first meeting, and those who were here, which was everybody, I guess, except you, Aline, voted to tear the tower down.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's correct.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You know, the thing is what slipped out of this whole conversation, if this were a great tower.

MRS. SAARINEN: Exactly, that is what I was trying to bring out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If it were a great piece of architecture, you would not worry about space or anything, but it isn't.

MR. ROCHE: It seems to me an essential part of the whole thing, though, is that the other half should be completed exactly the same --

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's right. That conversation about the White House is really something.

MR. ROCHE: If you're not completing the other half, if you are compromising the other half in some way, then you might say, why not leave this building here?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you could do the other half in Romanesque.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, it puts a different light on it.

MR. ROCHE: The essential point is with the understanding the other half be completed. Has the architect undertaken to do that?

MR. BUNSHAFT: He has had it approved by us.

MR. ROCHE: Is it really the same detail with the columns?

MRS. SAARINEN: You see, what they are trying to do now, which I think is worrisome and why I think whatever argument we put, we should not put solely on that basis, although I agree with you it's the essential one, as you can

tell from this presentation today, he's now beginning the argument you cannot do that and the detailing won't be good, and therefore you need this quote "just", you see, so I think whatever statement we want to make on or off the record, that certainly the fact that it will be completed that way is the major point, but in addition to that, there's the fact that this is not a great piece of architecture; it is not even a quaint and entrancing piece of architecture. You see, it is a tower without a base, and therefore, from every point of view --

MR. ROCHE: I would not argue, certainly, for just retaining the tower. I can see a certain argument for retaining the building if the addition is somewhat watered down version of the original architecture.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes.

MR. ROCHE: It seems to me if we have assumed it is and we don't know, and if the GSA will come back six months from now, and say, you know, "You really must be kidding if you think we were going to do all those columns and all that other stuff. We couldn't possibly afford to do that."

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't agree with that premise. I think the basic elementary premise is that this is an ugly building that is not worth keeping up under any condition.

MR. ROCHE: Well, I disagree with the thing on architectural terms. I would not make any argument at all, I think it's just a lot of sentimental, emotional --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I know you don't like to hear speeches, but I'm going to make one.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, as long as it's free.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we are talking about is great cities of Europe, which have preserved old buildings throughout the years. Right? That's the sort of sample we guide ourselves with. We are a young country. Actually, the beauty of old cities has been done through destruction, not preservation. There have been destroyed all minor buildings, because if you kept a civilization of 2,000 years, and kept every half-baked building, there wouldn't be any place for succeeding generations, and what has been preserved is the very best of the essence. Period.

I'll be you there were dozens of buildings like this along the Rue de Rivoli when they built it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Every building that has been preserved doesn't mean it's the greatest building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's an ugly building and the tower is a joke; it is not a tower in the first place, it's a turret

on top of the building.

MR. ROCHE: I don't think there's any argument about that.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's their premise . . . this point.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Let's say the addition that we have insisted followed the original plan. They insisted on it. Now, let's say they change to modern, let's say they do that. You've got modern, half-baked Romanesque, and classical.

MR. ROCHE: If we approved the thing on the basis that this was completing -- if you regard this whole complex as a single building, so you say you are completing half of an existing building and you complete it in exactly the same style and detail as the original building, and if we approve it on that basis, and then this thing is demolished, and then the hard facts, the realities of construction costs today and everything else come into and it comes back and a year from now everybody is sick of the whole thing, and they say, well, this is the best we can do under the circumstances, I really think it would be wrong to do it on that basis.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't.

MR. ROCHE: I think if we can clearly establish that nobody wants to save the tower, that is just a nonsensical idea. There might be some merit in saving the original

building, some sentimental merit or argument for saving it, particularly if the complex of the other building is not available to us anyway. Then I think Warnecke's original approach is more valid.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Warnecke's was keeping the tower.

MRS. SMITH: Mainly I am puzzled by Mr. Hunter's agreement with us, asking for a very strong statement. Now, according to that, GSA has turned around.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's not true; I've talked to Hunter. I talked to him about this because I called him up. They are very neutral.

MRS. SAARINEN: Let's see what Chloethiel thinks.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, do you want to say more?

MRS. SMITH: Well, I just want to say -- I gather Gordon has talked to Len Hunter -- that we should talk to them because they were at the meeting, and say we were told that, you know, you now want the tower, having gone along with us at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is along the line of what I want to say. No action is required today from this Commission whatsoever, is that true?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would suggest that we take no action today whatsoever. Have GSA in at our next meeting and discuss it again with them. This is not an imminent project. We are not holding up anything. It is perfectly reasonable to fiddle along on it.

MRS. SAARINEN: Has anybody heard any more from the architect who the last time we heard from him was --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We could have the architect and GSA both in.

MRS. SAARINEN: He made a very honest presentation of all the possible ways he could incorporate this tower.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would like very much to adopt this course of action. I'm totally against us taking a flamboyant vote now, defiantly saying, "You must tear down that tower." I think it is unnecessary. Let's put it on ice until the next meeting and have them in again.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have no objections but we have voted twice to tear down the tower.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is quite true and the record shows it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think myself the Planning Commission will be, could be slightly influenced by what we do. That is the only reason for any --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We've taken two votes. They are influenced by those votes, I am sure. They are well aware of those votes. I strongly recommend if there are no objections, that we proceed along those lines. We will have GSA and the architects in, and we may have to have them in a dozen times. It is a big issue visually on the Avenue and is worth our time.

Any objections?

MRS. SMITH: No.

MR. ROCHE: no.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No objections so long as they tear the tower down. Do you think there is a possibility that this tower would be preserved?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I didn't say that.

(National Gallery of Art)

MR. CARTER BROWN: As you know, Mr. Pei is ill, but we have Mr. Freed over here who is one of his partners and has been in on this project from the beginning.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are mentally shifting gears from the post office tower, so if we look amused, it is not because of your project.

MR. FREED: How would you like us to proceed?

EVERETT H

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Commission has had a chance to look at both the model and drawings, and unless you have some particular thing you want to explain to us, we want to just proceed with questions from us.

Make a brief general presentation. There are three members who have not seen it. I had forgotten that we saw it privately in New York.

MR. FREED: I think first of all we started with a site which is a trapezoid at the end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and it is a section of Pennsylvania Avenue between Third Street and Fourth Street, and it was to hold the building line on Pennsylvania Avenue, which was one of the givens, the building line on the mall. Of course because of the great axiality of the museum, the gallery itself, to hold that face and the decenteralizing quality of that facade. In other words, we had to be symmetrical on that site. So very quickly we found that the urban design considerations limited us, but they also liberated us in a way.

So, taking the trapezoid which is a very difficult form to work with and taking Mr. Brown's program, which made it easy because it called really for two parts, we developed the basic form of the building that is two triangles,

the larger triangle for the museum, the smaller for the Institute of Advanced Studies in Arts.

Then further in the development of this, as we talked to the gallery, we found the gallery had a very unique concept of exposition, that apparently Mr. Brown had gone to various museums in this country and other countries and that the gallery had realized that most museums are so organized there is a thing I think you call "museum fatigue." You just see too much. There is too much to be seen at all times. You go through too many spaces, you never look back, and never know where you are.

I think really at the prompting of Mr. Brown, we developed the concept of the house museum; that is a museum with separate unique houses, which can have separate unique shows which can be closed off, which can occupy one for the amount of one's visit without over-exposing you to the museum. You see what you go to see and come back. The house concept then was developed further here in three houses, which are vertical and that are volumes.

Now this again made it easier to involve one further problem, and that is the similarity of materials. The

existing gallery is all marbbble, very beautiful Tennessee pink marble. The new gallery or the new addition to it was again to be marble. Very difficult we found. We tested many, many possible solutions and finally found in conjunction with the program we were able to find that solution which to us was most satisfactory; thatis, a volumetric solution, volumes that are sheathed in marble and between them we span with concrete.

I think all of this, the members who saw this in June had seen at that time, and the only change subsequently that was made to that was one of the buildings itself; namely, that we have increased the height a bit, and we did so because we thought that perhaps the urban design considerations were ones that should guide us at this time, and we would like to ask whether you think we're on the right track by making that part of Pennsylvania Avenue, terminating the Avenue and try to raise it at the end of the Avenue up at elevation of about 118 feet, with a cornice line somewhat similar to the FBI building further on.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you.

Does that satisfy you, Mrs. Saarinen, as a preliminary?

MRS. SAARINEN: Architecturally, yes, but I am just

terribly confused about all these house museums. This is just my own curiosity. All of those acres of the National Gallery will continue to contain what they do, and there will be special exhibitions?

MR. BROWN: Part of it will be. If you enter from the concourse level, from the ground or enter at grade, and go down a wonderful wide staircase, which will be an open space and hopefully get light into it, you'll have four temporary exhibitions in all of this space (indicating on drawing), but the program called for liberating as much space in this present building as we could, by first of all clearing out the library and the offices and creating a center for advanced study of visual arts, which would fundamentally be expressed, a library which is expressed by this reading room which will have the stacks visible and will serve the community from across the country with graduates coming to complete their research, and so forth. This liberates a lot of exhibition space in this building. This building was built on the principle that you achieve the outside form and then fill out inside as the collections grow. There is still a little room left which has not been taken over for exhibition but is pack jammed with storage.

We are now facing this tremendous space problem, both for offices and for storage, so the new building would first of all liberate space for this, and then while we were building, the concept on the program was that whatever exhibition space that could also on this same principle be created at this time, so you can do it in one architectural coup and really create something fine and not have addenda stuck on over generations. Let's do it now and get it done, while it can still be afforded, so this is what we call space bacnk primarily.

We will probably move some of the Twentieth Century things over as a nucleus for the exhibition of this building, but we have to think in terms of the Twentieth Century and there will be considerable art over the dam in the meantime, and we just won't have space in this building.

MRS. SAARINEN: What makes anyone who comes to one go to the other?

MR. BROWN: Hopefully it will be very attractive for them. There is a cross-section here (indicating). Our present cafeteria is woefully inadequate. There are lines in the summer, people waiting three-quarters of an hour or an hour to get into it. What we want to do is clear up that space and liberate that for gallery uses and for expanded

laboratory, for example, which would be much more convenient and close to the shipment of works of art. We will then develop underground a much larger cafeteria which will be open to light that will come down through this circle, which also acts as a focus for the new plaza we are creating above it, and this then will mean that people hopefully will be attracted both ways. This will serve both buildings.

MR. FREED: It will also make it much easier to get there from the existing building.

MR. BROWN: But we hope also on the surface and this is one thing that has developed a good deal, is to carpet with Belgium block this plaza here, (indicating on drawing), and leave trees in here. This door then would be open at all times, as it is not, and be a major entrance to the gallery. If bus traffic is eventually taken off the mall, the school busses can come in here and this will eventually become an urban room, a great outdoor space as the third of these units.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think the principal considerations of this Commission are both the exterior design and materials, and that crucial height of the building. This is our function in this city, and we are Congress' advisers

in this sense, and we must consider whether it is proper to go this high at this point in relation, particularly, to the U.S. Capitol.

I think that's what we ought to really bend our principle -- it is interesting to find out how they are solving their problems. We had hoped that the gallery itself was satisfied--

MRS. SAARINEN: That was my curiosity.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: satisfied with the proposals and solutions you have made. We must concentrate on the exterior, the materials, and the height.

So would you explain the height in relation a bit to the surrounding buildings?

MR. FREED: Surely. As you know, a new height has been established for Pennsylvania Avenue, and I believe the FBI building which is one of the first on the Avenue is taking that cornice line which I believe is 120 feet. The cornice line in general of the existing buildings is somewhat lower. They're about 114, 110 to 114 feet. This is what we had asked -- to continue Pennsylvania Avenue.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He's talking about the cornice line on the same side of the Avenue as the museum is on.

MR. FREED: And continue that cornice line.

In other words, we say this building is the same height as these cornice lines (indicating on drawing), as you look down Pennsylvania Avenue, after it has opened into the space that leads to the gallery, then finishing the Avenue off at its end with another building of approximately the same cornice line that is somewhat higher than the cornice line of the gallery.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Like how much?

MR. FREED: The gallery cornice has several lines. We're using this line, the spring line of the dome which is the same line as the rest of Pennsylvania Avenue, and which is approximately the same line as the Museum of Natural History main cornice line.

MRS. SAARINEN: The line of the dome, not the roof line?

MR. FREED: This line which is also approximately the tip of the Capitol (indicating). Now this line follows through on this cornice line of Pennsylvania Avenue.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. There are visual interruptions to that line. Archives goes above it. We are not saying there can be no variation from that line. The dome goes up. We want to make a very careful decision

on this because you are proposing a continuous cornice line that is higher considerably than the visual line of the existing museum, and we just want the decision to be right.

MR. BROWN: Well, we are very much hopeful -- I am, at least -- from the gallery's point of view that you'll consider this. I have given a lot of thought and would like to just bring out two considerations which have been useful in my own thinking. I've done a lot of driving and walking around here, trying to visualize. As you drive down Constitution Avenue, what you see is not this building (indicating on drawing) until you almost come upon it. It will be very difficult to see this building in relation to this building, as you come down Constitution. On the other hand, as you come down Pennsylvania, that is what you see, and once you're in the Pennsylvania mood, as it were, it does seem logical to have something that will continue the Pennsylvania axis.

The other situation I ran across just by chance, as I was coming in from the station, is to realize that in foreshortening the present gallery building silhouette to its section, its massive bulk, and what you really see as you approach it from this axis (indicating) is the silhouette of the ridge line of the two pediments coming out,

the whole bulk of it, and that way it does bulk up a lot more than when you see it horizontally.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Actually, on Pennsylvania Avenue there isn't a continuous cornice line.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, there isn't.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is only on the mall side.

MR. ROCHE: I'd like to say I agree with what Mr. Brown just said. I quite completely by coincidence found the same results in looking at heights with relation to the Aquarium.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I agree with having the terminus too a little higher than the National Gallery. I think there ought to be a terminus and it ought to be positive. The cornice line has nothing to do with it. The National Gallery is a thousand feet long and this is a much shorter element and could in my book have more bulk.

MR. ROCHE: The drawings are very deceiving on the National Gallery. The presence of it is quite different.

MRS. SAARINEN: Just very honestly, if the program were different, and did not need as much space, would you still honestly architecturally wish to make this the terminus of the Avenue?

MR. BROWN: May I tell you a secret? May I go off the record?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MRS. SAARINEN: Then it was desirable esthetically for your building?

MR. FREED: For urban design considerations.

MRS. SAARINEN: Really? Not for better proportions within the building?

MR. ROCHE: In the meeting last summer we encouraged this direction.

MRS. SAARINEN: I see.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That does not mean it is binding on this group.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I don't think there is anything wrong with the proportions of all the facades. I think this height business is a big void in between this and any other building. It is really a large piece of sculpture in a sense, and ought to have its own form. I personally think it's fine and might be unusual.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do any other members of the Commission have questions?

Mrs. Smith, do you have questions?

MR. SMITH: No, I think it's a very exciting building. I am not worried about the height.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, we will take it under advisement and thank you very much.

Tell Mr. Pei we hope he gets well soon.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm interested to see no one worries about the height. It definitely does worry me. The space on the Pennsylvania Avenue side really falls away. There is a triangle there. You can say they match. They don't, you know. It's quite different. I think it is going to look peculiar myself.

MRS. SAARINEN: The thing that worries me is precedent-setting, too. Gordon's remark about well, it is a building that needs that -- boy! We can open up a barn door on that.

We are talking about Pennsylvania Avenue but there's also a whole mall here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm just saying so Archives is on the mall, too, and I don't think that has anything to do with cornice lines, and I think it's a good building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I like it. I am not trying to vote for one continuous line down the Avenue and will not be interpreted that way. This building has a totally different kind of silhouette than any of the buildings that exist along the Avenue. Look---it ends in shock points. This is a very simple silhouette; it is going to loom up in relation to the U.S. Capitol.

MRS. SAARINEN: When I look at it in relation to the end of the Avenue and the Capitol, it worries me. It is a big assertive building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And is going to look awfully isolated alone and stark.

MRS. SAARINEN: Everything else ends up this way (indicating with gestures), and this ends up like that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are allowing an architect to do something we would not dream of permitting, putting a fake space for his own esthetic decision about the shape of the city.

MR. ROCHE: I agree entirely with making a very strong ending. The building is a little angular.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you look down here (indicating on model), this is Pennsylvania Avenue. You really don't have a cornice line. You have a couple of towers.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm not worried about the cornice line.

MRS. SAARINEN: You don't have a cornice line, but you do have a very strong sawed-off-at-the-top building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What you have here is a kind of tower that terminates this thing just like this gazebo is a tower.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think it's a beautiful building, only I share the worry a little bit.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, the record will show that we have these grave doubts.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes, I think the building is beautiful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you want to vote on this? Well, I'll just poll. You are in favor of it, Chloethiel?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Kevin, you are in favor of it. Gordon, you're in favor.

MRS. SAARINEN: I am in favor of it but I am scared to death.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gordon, you are in favor of it?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm going to cast a vote against it because I think it should be lower.

MRS. SAARINEN: This is the first time I've seen it. Can one not vote, can one reserve judgment on it? Is that a possible decision?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have four in favor.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it's approved.

MRS. SAARINEN: Seriously, I wasn't at that meeting that you were. This is the first time I have seen it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: He had that interior right there and some little section.

MR. ROCHE: He had the relationships.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We discussed that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What you are monkeying around with here, if somebody said, "Let's take ten feet off," you ruin the whole proportion, and you're not accomplishing anything.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, Gordon, I'm certainly not going to say, "Go slice ten feet off your building." We don't say that to anybody. We say we think it is too high in relation to other buildings, and it is a problem to solve it.

I think it's a beautiful building and would like to think about this, really.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, one vote has been reserved.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So there are four that are for it, so it's been approved. You are just talking about your own record, Aline, aren't you, and your conscience?

MR. ATHERTON: That completes our business.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think it is such a beautiful building I don't like not coming at positively for it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You can write a letter on the subject, if you want, really, and we will put it in the record.

MR. ROCHE: Why don't you vote unanimously and then write a letter telling about your reservations about it? It's as good a way to do it as any.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, I wouldn't participate in unanimous vote of approval. I feel very strongly it is too high as a silhouette in that spot.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All he wants is clearance to go ahead. He doesn't care whether it is unanimous.

MRS. SAARINEN: I wonder if my conscience will bother me five years from now and the rest of my life.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If there is no more business to

come before the Commission, we will adjourn.

(Whereupon, at 12:32 o'clock, p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

February 25, 1970

Dear Mr. Brown:

I am writing to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's approval today of the design for the east building addition to the National Gallery of Art.

I believe I can summarize the Commission's opinion by saying that the architect has produced a most noteworthy and exciting design. It has great strength and yet at the same time it is tempered with a simplicity that belies the complex nature of the site and program.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. J. Carter Brown, Director
National Gallery of Art
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D. C. 20565

uniform plan. We are aware the plan is adapted to the animals' behavior; otherwise, you'll get into a long thing about that.

MR. ATHERTON: The zoo people are here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: While it is fresh in our minds, let's just have the zoo people in.

MRS. SMITH: Let us suggest they make a model, even if it is smaller scale.

MRS. SAARINEN: I don't think we need that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think if you get something good, it will speak for itself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You can read that. We are trying to save them money. They're the poorest people.

MR. ROCHE: Is this a project to be financed by federal funds?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Entirely. There isn't any other source.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But they may have money, Kevin, to make drawings which may not pop up in a building five months from now.

MR. ATHERTON: This is Mr. Rousos from Metcalf Associates.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We want to have a general conversation with you, rather than any kind of presentation.

EXHIBIT J

As you know, we've been zoo lovers for a long time, been following various stages of this. We have been over the models and drawings and have asked Mr. Roche to sort of lead off on what our general feelings are, and then we will just have general discussion among us.

It is not a formal stage of approving specific buildings or anything.

MR. ROUSOS: No, no. This is strictly a master plan, assimilating all the elements together in a master plan. We are still talking about Roman numeral I, rather than little points.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. In that context, would you lead off? Mr. Roche.

MR. ROCHE: The reaction, if I may put it that way, of the Commission was that perhaps too much architectural effort is in the design, and there are two possible ways to go from there. One is to quiet down all the buildings and get a, let's say, less expressive, quieter architectural style, and the other direction which might be explored is one you have already started in this group here (indicating on drawing). This area here, which attempts to develop buildings which in fact do not exist as buildings, but exist as part of the landscaping. You could somehow make the

buildings disappear in the landscaping and terracing.
That might be a very good direction.

I am sure that there are other comments.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft, will you keep going?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes. We understand there are about five buildings proposed in this plan.

MR. ROUSOS: Yes, that's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: These forms have been studied as a result of function, circular, one with triangles, some sort of building for people that is sort of odd-shaped, and it looks like about five different architects all in their own style, you know, one doing triangles, another circles, and so forth.

We think that each building ought to somehow be a plan that reflects the program of how people see and how the animals live and all that.

It seemed to me it would be nice if it were done with a discipline of design philosophy, even if that philosophy got to be put putting it all underground, but if it isn't, the philosophy could be structural system with unity.

We do not see that here. It looks like each one is off on its own. One looks World Fairish, the other the latest cliques of triangles, and so forth.

I don't get the feeling that they're the result of a function. I think they are the result of architectural imagination.

MRS. SAARINEN: Has one architect done them?

MR. ROUSOS: We've done them all.

MRS. SAARINEN: You say "we"?

MR. ROUSOS: Metcalf and ASsociates, my office, has done them all.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, has it been a different designer for each one? Have you given one person giraffes and another monkeys?

MR. ROUSOS: No, no. A group of us have been doing it together and have been doing so all along.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There are existing buildings that are going to force a certain variety. Here is a chance to tie the project down with five major buildings. You don't get the feeling that there is any --

MR. ROUSOS: I think, if I might say something to bring some facts out about this, the program for this is quite a complicated program. What you have for a multi-climate house you cannot possibly have for a monkey house. A monkey house is conceived entirely as an exterior exhibit, whereas a multi-climate house is conceived as an interior exhibit

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think I made my point. I think each of those buildings could do what the animals need and all that, and would look like -- I don't think we're talking about affecting the function, exaggerating or making a drama of the function, but within a discipline -- materials, structure, and design philosophy, whatever that is.

MR. ROUSOS: Well, the material, Phase V, these two buildings (indicating photograph) have been developed more than any others, any that we have done. We are trying to stay essentially with the same materials throughout; that is the paving material, all the material for pedestrian circulation route shown there will be the same.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are not saying you haven't got it. We havenot looked at the materials and don't want to because we are not at that stage yet, but we mean in the total design. We are concerned about the change of structure and motif and whatnot in each of these buildings.

MR. ROUSOS: I think I understand what you are telling me. I think you're saying we have too many shapes, too many diverse shapes, and therre's not a uniformity in the handling.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't mean in a dull way, but it ought to look like one architect or one architectural firm

did it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Saarinen brought up an interesting point in our discussion. Do you want to develop it, Aline, about is this reflecting the most contemporary thinking in zooism or the science of showing animals? Are we building something that is already old hat in the exhibition of animals? We just pose this as a question.

MRS. SAARINEN: I was curious because coming from New York, where there's a great deal of building going on in the Bronx Zoo, and a great many discussions about display of animals, outdoor habitat, and so forth.

MR. ROUSOS: Well, I think the essence of that has to do with each individual animal. I think that primarily this might sound harsh to say, but it's not an architectural problem primarily; it is a zoo problem. It has to do with keeping the animals and finding people in the zoo who will take care of their particular exhibits, who will clean and so on, and so forth. Now, what we have tried to do here is give commodious accommodations to the animals, to remember that animals are much more diverse than people. You cannot do an office building for animals here, because animals are not the same; they are not all people, so

we have tried to take care of that single fact.

We have studied each animal specifically to see what their requirements are.

For example, a cage in the feline house for the cheetahs is done in such a way that it allows the animal to cavort and run and to be able to live in that particular enclosure as well as possible in Washington, D.C., as he could in Africa, but this animal needs horizontal distances where he can open up and go 60 miles an hour for short distances, whereas another kind of animal, for example, another type of cat requires a tree which he climbs on and he sort of sits there most of the day. He doesn't run or exercise.

I think that perhaps this is what we've tried to do. We have tried to approach the requirements of the animal. What's a good exhibit for each particular animal and then tried to tailor the buildings within these parameters. Maybe that's one of the reasons that Mr. Bunshaft --

MRS. SAARINEN: No, we all understand that, but there are two different questions. One is we are all aware that you need different kinds of buildings for different kinds of animals. Nobody was saying anything about that. We were just saying you can build a school which is for

little children and an office building, and they can still have the same point of view of architecture, although the plan and everything would be different. That is what he was saying.

My question was just one of curiosity about whether -- I assume it's not you but the Zoological Society, whatever it is in Washington, which has set up this program; but the business of buildings rather than having lions and great bear pits and things like that, there seems to be so much building and so little land left. Is this because this is an old-fashioned zoo or the small amount of space?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have a zoo expert.

MR. ROUSOS: This is Mr. Maloney.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is not just the architecture. We are talking the philosophy of zoos.

MR. MALONEY: Our space is rather limited in the zoo, and an awful lot of it is hills and dales. The spot you are looking at there is the prime and only building land that we have--that and the area that is already developed up above the elephant house and bird house, so we are trying to make the most of the land that we have.

We have quite a few animals, quite a few exhibits, and Mr. Rousos and our architects really have responded.

We have an unusual requirement. The giraffe house is a geometric looking thing but the giraffe itself is a geometric looking thing. Get him in a house and it has to be a little higher than --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you could do an approach to this--you know, architects do buildings. Landscape architects do grading. Sculptors stand statues around. I think if you got serious about this, you could do this as a molded sculptural landscape, where through retaining walls and change in grade you could solve everything for the animals, everything for the movement of people, and have that appear that there are no buildings. That would be -- you know -- I think we all take a lot and put a building on it, and I think that mere mention of hills and valleys, you can make man-made hills, and I think Kevin was trying to say that, where you have openings in the hillside for the animals to have all the fun, and it could be a very ingenious experience where the animals would have all the privacy they need and the visitors would have the experience of sometimes looking down, sometimes looking up, sometimes sitting in a park with nothing around.

I don't know about the rock on that site. That would

be an approach.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's the crux of our statement on this issue. Before he blurs it with details, that is the crux.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, it comes down to our separation in our world of architecture, landscape, artists. It could be done as one total thing. Noguchi with a good architect, and all the technical things you want, because in the first place, all of these things are mechanically controlled. Here everything is mechanically controlled, both for people and animals. Now that would be something for that site, which is quite a fabulous site. That would take a total concept, and you might have the experience of the visitor being in a space sometimes and looking out of it, outdoors, and not even knowing the experience, you know -- not just going out the front door of a building and walking through the front door of another building. That could be quite an unusual museum.

MR. ROUSOS: Mr. Bunshaft, we tried this in the beginning.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There are existing buildings and stuff, but --

MR. ROUSOS: There are existing buildings, there are problems of money, phasing, and all sorts of other things.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They are not important if you have a good idea. Money -- I'm not so sure about money. Rock costs money, but walls cost money, too.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is what I meant by blurring his fine statement.

MR. ROCHE: I think Gordon's statement is very good.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would be awfully happy if we rested on a good statement, rather than just arguing. It does present our general point of view toward it and you can then see what our criticisms are about this individual placing of buildings. It all stems from that. We would like to work further along this philosophical line.

MR. ROUSOS: Well, fine. Starting off we approached this problem very much the same way as you have described that we should approach it, and these buildings are existing, there are duck ponds existing, there are bus parking areas existing, there are all sorts of today's problems there. We cannot go to Dr. Reed and the Smithsonian Institution and say we're going to tear down this duck pond because it doesn't fit what we are going to do ten years from now. There is just not a way you can do this project today. I agree with you, we have stuck to the old concept of what the architecture would be here; i.e., building by building exhibits. We have tried to unify the whole thing within a

pedestrian circulation area, leaving cars, and all other things out of it, but if this is your wish, then fine. We will attempt it again.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We don't want to complicate your problems. We want to help you create something great here. That's what we want.

MRS. SAARINEN: But we have made two contradictory statements, Bill.

CH AIRMAN WALTON: All right, how?

MRS. SAARINEN: We have a first statement saying that we understand the separate buildings have different plans and functions, but we'd like to have a feeling of an architectural philosophy and concept as if one designer had done them in terms of structural systems, materials, and so on. Then we are saying to him, well, we really don't like that concept at all, we want you to do away with all that and build a whole another kind of thing.

We have to make clear that one is an ideal and the other is realistic.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I think our function is to propose ideals for various elements. I don't mind setting our sights as high as possible; you'll have to bring them down so we want to start up.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I say something?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think Aline has a point. I think the first two comments are realistic, you know, and all that. The comment about this great idea -- you know it is nothing unique -- I am sure you must have tried it -- we are not saying you must come back with that. That is No. 1. You know what I mean.

MR. ROUSOS: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Unless the people who employed you want to explore it. There might be some place where part of that could be introduced, taking a fresh look.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Sure.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The first two things are the normal criticism. The other is a dream. We can't say that you must come back with it all underground, but it might be good to see what can be done to develop some of that. This is going to be around a long time.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith.

MRS. SMITH: Also it's because it is a small site, I think, that we feel separating types of buildings that could be pulled together --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They are more disturbing on a small

site.

MRS. SMITH: They are really very close to one another. They could relate and become a total thing; they're not separate on their sites. They really influence one another greatly.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Roche.

MR. ROCHE: May I add one more thing? I don't think they are necessarily conflicting instructions at all, and we are not saying that these things should go underground. It is a question of how the materials are used, how people move around over them, how the landscape is related to them. It doesn't necessarily mean you have to fill up duc! ponds, tear out rocks, or cut down trees or anything like that. A sympathetic architecture, a more sympathetic architecture which would be more part of the landscape, more part of the natural, even more part of a developed background could be done, and then I would hope that would be rational and would not compromise you with respect to practical problems.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I just want to emphasize that we want to be helpful on it. I don't think we should go on with it indefinitely. We have a couple of other items. Unless you want to ask anything more. We are in a stage where

we don't have to do anything formal whatsoever.

MR. ROUSOS: Right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is a discussion session.

Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't know -- you might correct me, but I think your next submission might be quite sketchy and rough, if you have some ideas of anything like we're talking about. In other words, it takes quite a bit to get a presentation like this. If you have any ideas that develop from what you've heard from us, it would be welcome to see them in the interim in any form, you know, that architects can understand.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Sure. Thank you very much.

MR. ROUSOS: Thank you very much.

MR. MALONEY: Gentlemen, Dr. Reed sends his regrets at not being able to be with you. He's in Nairobi.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Tell him we miss him.

We wish him luck in his hunting.

12 March 1970

Dear Mr. Badger:

Plans for a number of new buildings at the National Zoo (Phase 6) were reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on the 25th of February. Included were designs for animal displays as well as a major new visitor center incorporating dining facilities and lecture halls.

The Commission's chief criticism is what could be defined as undue emphasis on architectural style. Each building appears to be conceived as an end in itself, much in the same way a fair grounds or exposition would be designed. We feel such emphasis is out of place in a zoo. The architecture should be subordinate to the animal displays and to the landscaping, acting as a sympathetic foil to each. Ideally the architecture should be diminished as much as possible in order to highlight the animals in the landscape. That is not to say that all the buildings should be underground or that the natural setting has to be preserved as is. We know this is impossible. However, as a point of departure, it's the kind of feeling that should run through the new designs.

We believe that by suppressing the variety of architectural forms and by using the same materials throughout, this quality will be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. William A. Badger
Regional Director, Region 3
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20407

EXHIBIT K

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

25 February 1970

AM

- 10:00 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, Interior Department Building
- II. ADMINISTRATION
- a. Dates of Next Meetings: 18 March and 15 April 1970
- b. Approval of Minutes of 21 January 1970 Meeting
- III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS
1. Presidents Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue
Appeal to Retain the Old Post Office Tower as a part
of Federal Triangle Plans
2. National Gallery of Art
East Building of the National Gallery of Art - Proposed
Design
3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service
National Zoological Park - Phase 6: Site and Building
Plans for Display of Apes, Monkeys, Lions and Giraffes
4. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
Pepco Electrical Substation, 3rd and E Sts., S.E. -
Resubmission of Proposed Exterior Materials
5. American Battle Monuments Commission
Proposed Selection of Paul Thiry as architect for
Distinguished Military Actions Commemorative Program
6. Department of the Army, Heraldic Division
a. Congressional Space Medal - Proposed Design
b. Presidential Citizens Medal - Proposed Design
7. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development
Shipstead-Luce Act - Appendix 1
Old Georgetown Act - Appendix 2

IV. INTERVIEWS

- 11:30 1. Presidents Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue

Appeal to Retain the Old Post Office Tower as a part of
Federal Triangle Plans
- 12:00 2. National Gallery of Art

East Building of the National Gallery of Art - Proposed
Design
- 12:30 3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Zoological Park - Phase 6: Site and Building
Plans for Display of Apes, Monkeys, Lions and Giraffes

